Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
1/11/76

Mr. Ford Rowan personal
NBC News
4001 Nebraska Ave., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ford,

Shortly after the last time we spoke I developed Phlebitis, without the side benefits now popularly associated with it. So I do what travelling I must only and I'm not in Washington often. When I am I do not drive. Not yet, anyway.

Tonight I had a call from a stranger who called me about your interview with Colby last Thursday. Not knowing it would be on I missed it. He began by asking me if I knew about MK Ultra and MK Delta and had any reason to believe there might be a connection with my work. He wondered if the code names had come up in my work. They haven't but they seem familiar, like I'd read about them. He linked this with the Olson case. (I first knew Eric Olson when he was 15 but never knew Frank.)

I do get some nut calls. This was not one. He knew details of the Olson case, for example, that I do not and I've followed the reporting fairly diligently.

He does not have my books yet seems to have a chargknowledge of fact as well as the controversy about the Warren Report.

He does not live near here but gets the Washington Post. Peterson's story about me several weeks ago in the Maryland section, he said, is why he called me. Perhaps. And people who live far away do subscribe to the Post. But wait a month to call a stranger and talk for an hour and a half?

He is articulate, intelligent, well-informed and seems to have some intelligence knowledge. During the course of the conversation I referred to "black books" without his asking what they are. Few people know.

He has some reason for thinking I should talk to you about what you aired and what he thinks you know, suspect or both.

I know nothing about these projects. He did say that in an earlier form there was a project with this name, in 1951, under a Dr. Sidney Cohen, in Los Angeles. For all I know you may have aired this.

I formed the impression during this conversation that this man had an intelligence connection in the past. I therefore think it is possible he may have some knowledge. He says I will be hearing from him again after I return from a trip I'll leave on Thursday. I asked him to hold off until after the 21st, when there is a deadline call on one of my Freedom of Information Act cases, one that has already been productive.

If you have a transcript of the interview or can lend me a sound tape of preferably both I'm willing to take the time to pay close attention. If anything come of this I'll be glad to give it to you. I can't keep up with my major preoccupations now.

Pretty clearly this man is not irrational. He was subtle in his insistence so it can't fairly be called insistence, but he seems to have some reason for thinking you and I should talk about this. I'm willing if you think it worthwhile. Unless he has reason to believe that these projects had a connection with assassinations his reason for calling me of all people isn't clear. I'm not uneasy about his calling me instead of better-known people in the field because an intelligent man would know the great differences in our approaches, that I do my own investigating and analyses, work with fact and not the popular speculations. That it was suggested to him is not impossible.

He knows about me what was not in the Post story, the price of my books, all but the last. I have sold none to bookstores in his area and he referred to the price by mail, which is slightly more. But I have no recollection of having sent even a flyer on the books to his area. His name was not familiar to my wife, who does all the mailing I do not.

He has to have had some reason for calling me rather than, say, Lane. Or Fensterwald. (He did not know of my connection with the King case, only JFK and that I keep after the government to end suppressions.) Going along with this I would say that his opinion of the Post story is a bit inflated. Or, that the Post story may not have been the real reason he called me.

If his call had not impressed me I'd not be taking this time because I can't and don't keep the hours I did for years and I should be in bed. While it is not impossible that he is an intelligent, informed theoriser, I did not get this impression and in an hour and a half he gave no indication of any such tendency. I did get the conversation to wandering to give him the opportunity. In the course of this, when he gave me the inconspicuous opportunities, I satisfied myself that he is not a regular reader of the Post or if he is, he is a selective one. When he turned the conversation to Terry Lenzner's representation of Dr. Gottlieb (which I had not know) and wondered I had a chance to compare with Phil Hirsakop, who has been in the Post often and conspicuously recently. In my opinion a Post reader in a distant rural-type area is much more likely to read the main news or the Metro sections than the weekly suburban supplement. Oddly, while he said he didn't know of Hirsakop he did know of the Hunt case, which Phil won, and the approximate time of its end. Now that case there is another had CIA involvements in the defense's allegations. The remaining one does not. In the remaining case H.L.'s boys are charged with obstructing justice. This is the more serious charge. The first was a wire-tapping case. (They're guilty in both cases, if acquitted in the first.)

I think I will hear further from this man. I can't be certain but I think he knows something and didn't dare say it on the phone and fears the mails. (With me he is right on both counts and I'll be going over it soon, sometime after the 16th, when it becomes possible under the law.) But if you have no interest, all I can do is listen to whatever he is able to get to me.

It is pretty farout, but if this man still has spook connection he could know that I've been after the CIA for their files on me. There are conscientious people in the CIA who want the dirty stuff ended. I have been pretty forthright with them letting them know quite explicitly that I have copies from different files of what they allege does not exist. They began by their general counsel insisting that they have nothing on me, but without giving me what I have they have given me stuff as far back as when I gave Jimmy Roosevelt material for one of FDR's more memorable fireside chats. That dates to before I was in OSS. At the same time they gave me, shall I call it an accident? the proof of how they lied to their general counsel and the existence of files on me not checked and not disclosed. Farout or not, I do not believe they are this stupid. So, improbable as it may be, I do not consider it entirely impossible that this stranger might be fed by people he once knew or worked with. And what makes this more interesting in view of his knowledge of the Hunt case is that the CIA has me in a file they have not given me but parts of which I have that involves a central figure in that case who is a friend and may be a CIA source, directly or indirectly. What makes all of this more fascinating is that as some in the CIA have to know, I have a complete story I've never used on a CIA front that is unexposed to this day. Not being able to sell the story I've been saving it for this suit. I'm certain they do not dare give me voluntarily what they have. They don't dare expose their front. Briefly, it is a part of CIA that seems to be other than CIA and is almost entirely unknown that engages in a special kind of domestic intelligence. Or, if farout, not entirely impossible.

If you can send me a tape, a cassette would be easier for me. I'll be in D.C, the 21st and 2/4. Best regards, Harold Weisberg